arXiv:1704.04405v1 [quant-ph] 14 Apr 2017

Classical simulation of quantum circuits by dynamical localization: analytic results for Pauli-observable propagation in time-dependent disorder

Adrian Chapman[1,*] and Akimasa Miyake[1,†]

[1] *Center for Quantum Information and Control, Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM 87131, USA*

(Dated: April 17, 2017)

We extend the concept of Anderson localization, the confinement of quantum information in a spatially irregular potential, to quantum circuits. Considering matchgate circuits generated by a time-dependent spin-$\frac{1}{2}$ XY Hamiltonian, we give an analytic formula for the Lieb-Robinson bounded commutator norm of a local observable, and show that it can be efficiently evaluated by a classical computer even when the explicit Heisenberg time evolution cannot. Because this quantity bounds the average error incurred by truncating the evolution to a spatially limited region, we demonstrate dynamical localization as a mechanism for classically simulating quantum computation, using examples of localized phases under certain spatio-temporal disordered Hamiltonians.

Introduction.—A peculiar phenomenon exhibited uniquely by quantum lattice systems is the suppression of conductance in the presence of disorder. This effect, known as *Anderson localization* [1–4] in the single-particle setting and *many-body localization* [5–11] in the interacting-multi-particle regime, is a result of interference, which confines a local disturbance to a bounded region near its initial position for very long times. Localizing systems are therefore interesting as examples of systems which fail to thermalize [12–16], since local subsystems retain information about their initial conditions forever.

Another important feature of localizing systems is that they have many properties whose classical evaluation is efficient, including their local integrals of motion [17, 18], Hamiltonian eigenbases [18–23], propagators [24, 25], and output-sampling [26]. This motivates us to view localization as a classical simulation tool for more general quantum evolution, such as quantum circuits, which have time-dependent Hamiltonians. However, there are very few prior investigations into this setting. Initial explorations into fluctuating disorder [27, 28] and Floquet circuit ensembles [29] suggest that a form of localization persists in these time-dependent cases, yet few analytic results are known in general.

In this paper, we pioneer an application of dynamical localization to solve a problem which is not known to have an otherwise classically efficient solution. Our setting is that of nearest-neighbor matchgate circuits, circuits on qubit systems which encode the dynamics of noninteracting fermions on a one-dimensional lattice with fully time-dependent single-particle Hamiltonians [30–36]. They thus constitute the natural framework in which to study the generalization of Anderson localization to quantum circuits. Despite the restriction to noninteracting dynamics however, some properties of these circuits are not known to be classically simulable. One example, which we consider in this work, is the expectation value of the Pauli observable $\hat{\sigma}^x$ on an arbitrary qubit in the output from a matchgate circuit acting on a general product-state input. Despite being local in the qubit picture, this observable takes the form of a long-range correlation function in the fermion picture and so requires exponential resources to simulate by brute force (though the distribution of such a measurement can be sampled efficiently, a weaker form of simulation, by the method in Ref. [37]). We solve this problem for circuits which describe localizing dynamics by exploiting the confinement of their measurement observables in the Heisenberg picture. In the time-independent case, this confinement is described formally by the so-called *zero-velocity Lieb-Robinson bound* [38]

$$||[\hat{A}, \hat{B}(t)]|| \lesssim \min(|t|, 1) e^{-\eta d(\hat{A},\hat{B})}. \tag{1}$$

This inequality states that the degree of noncommutativity between the local observable $\hat{A}$ and time-evolved observable $\hat{B}(t)$ with initially disjoint supports separated by lattice distance $d(\hat{A}, \hat{B})$, such that $[\hat{A}, \hat{B}] = 0$, for $\hat{B} \equiv \hat{B}(t = 0)$, is exponentially decaying with decay constant $\eta > 0$. It gives an effective speed at which disturbances propagate [39–42] for the localizing system, which approaches zero with increasing propagation time. Correlations between distant lattice sites therefore take exponential time to develop [43].

In the case where $\hat{A}$ and $\hat{B}$ are unitary, and the norm taken is the Frobenius norm $||\hat{O}||^2 \equiv \mathrm{tr}\left(\hat{O}^\dagger \hat{O}\right)$, the left-hand side of (1) is known as the infinite-temperature out-of-time-ordered correlation function (OTO correlator). This quantity has arisen as a useful diagnostic tool for studying quantum chaotic systems [44–48], including black holes [49–52], and recently, for many-body localization [53–57]. As a first result, we provide an analytic formula for this quantity when $\hat{A}$ is a single-site observable, $\hat{B}$ is a Pauli observable, and the time evolution is described by a matchgate circuit. This is surprising considering that the evolution itself cannot even be stored efficiently by a classical computer in general, and

so it constitutes an exponential speedup over the brute-force method. We next show that this quantity bounds the average-case change in expectation-value magnitude from truncating the Heisenberg evolution of $\hat{B}(t)$ to a subset of qubits and thus provides a measure of the expected error incurred by such truncation. Finally, we provide numerical analysis verifying the bound (1) for two natural models of time-dependent disorder and construct phase diagrams demonstrating their transitions to localizing dynamics and subsequent classical simulability.

Background.—Matchgate circuits on n qubits are generated by the time-dependent parent Hamiltonians

$$\hat{H}(t) = \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \sum_{k,k' \in \{x,y\}} \mu_j^{(k,k')}(t) \hat{\sigma}_j^k \hat{\sigma}_{j+1}^{k'} + \sum_{j=1}^{n} \nu_j(t) \hat{\sigma}_j^z, \quad (2)$$

where $\hat{\sigma}_j^k$ for $k \in \{x, y, z\}$ are the Pauli operators on qubit $j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$. We apply the Jordan-Wigner transformation to this Hamiltonian, defining the $2n$ Clifford operators $\{\hat{c}_\mu\}$ for $\mu \in \{1, \ldots, 2n\}$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{c}_{2k-1} &\equiv \otimes_{j=1}^{k-1} \hat{\sigma}_j^z \otimes \hat{\sigma}_k^x \\ \hat{c}_{2k} &\equiv \otimes_{j=1}^{k-1} \hat{\sigma}_j^z \otimes \hat{\sigma}_k^y \\ \hat{c}_\mu \hat{c}_\nu + \hat{c}_\nu \hat{c}_\mu &= 2\delta_{\mu\nu} \hat{\mathbb{1}}, \end{aligned}$$

where $k \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, and $\delta_{\mu\nu}$ is the Kronecker delta. Under time-ordered evolution $\hat{U}(t) \equiv \mathcal{T} \exp\left[i \int_0^t \hat{H}(\tau) d\tau\right]$, the Clifford operators transform as

$$\hat{U}^\dagger(t) \hat{c}_\mu \hat{U}(t) = \sum_{\nu=1}^{2n} u_{\mu\nu}(t) \hat{c}_\nu,$$

where $\mathbf{u}(t) \equiv \mathcal{T} \exp\left[4 \int_0^t \mathbf{h}(\tau) d\tau\right] \in \mathbf{SO}(2n)$, since $\mathbf{h}(t)$ is antisymmetric. From here, we will drop the explicit time dependence for notational convenience.

We introduce a *Clifford configuration* as an ordered tuple of indices $\vec{\alpha} \equiv (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \ldots, \alpha_k)$ of degree $|\vec{\alpha}| \equiv k$ with $\alpha_j \in \{1, \ldots, 2n\}$ and $\alpha_j < \alpha_{j+1}$ for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$. The corresponding *Clifford configuration operator* is the ordered product $\hat{C}_{\vec{\alpha}} \equiv \mathcal{P} \prod_{j=1}^{|\vec{\alpha}|} \hat{c}_{\alpha_j}$, with Clifford indices ascending from left to right. Finally, denote by $\mathbf{u}_{\vec{\alpha}\vec{\beta}}$ the submatrix of $\mathbf{u}$ given by taking the rows indexed by $\vec{\alpha}$ and the columns indexed by $\vec{\beta}$, i.e. $(\mathbf{u}_{\vec{\alpha}\vec{\beta}})_{jk} \equiv u_{\alpha_j \beta_k}$.

We show in the supplementary material that the Clifford configuration operators transform under matchgate evolution as

$$\hat{U}^\dagger \hat{C}_{\vec{\alpha}} \hat{U} = \sum_{\{\vec{\beta} \mid |\vec{\beta}| = |\vec{\alpha}|\}} \det\left(\mathbf{u}_{\vec{\alpha}\vec{\beta}}\right) \hat{C}_{\vec{\beta}}. \quad (3)$$

That is, the degree of a Clifford configuration operator is preserved, and configuration transition amplitudes are given by determinants of the corresponding single-Clifford transition submatrices. We also note that

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\sigma}_k^z &= -i \hat{C}_{(2k-1,2k)} \\ \hat{\sigma}_k^x &= (-i)^{k-1} \hat{C}_{(1,\ldots,2k-1)}. \end{aligned}$$

From Eq. (3), we see that the Heisenberg evolution of $\hat{\sigma}_k^z$ will always consist of $\binom{n}{2}$ terms, regardless of k. However, that of $\hat{\sigma}_k^x$ will consist of $\binom{n}{2k-1}$ terms, which may scale exponentially with n if k also scales with n, such as for $\hat{\sigma}_{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}^x$ in the center of the chain. This is reflected in the fact that $\langle \hat{U}^\dagger \hat{\sigma}_k^z \hat{U} \rangle$ can always be computed efficiently by a classical computer when the expectation values $\langle \hat{C}_{\vec{\beta}} \rangle$, for $|\vec{\beta}| = 2$, can be, such as for product input [34]. On the other hand, $\hat{U}^\dagger \hat{\sigma}_k^x \hat{U}$ cannot even be stored efficiently on a classical computer in the worst case, so the same strategy will not work. Nevertheless, localization will provide a means to efficiently approximate this quantity, as we state formally below.

Analytic results.—We are able to efficiently calculate the left-hand side of (1) in our setting by our first result

Theorem 1. *(Analytic OTO correlator) The matrix $\mathbf{M}_s$, defined implicitly in relation to the OTO correlator as*

$$\frac{1}{2^{n+2}} ||[\mathbf{n}_s \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_s, \hat{U}^\dagger \hat{B} \hat{U}]||^2 \equiv \mathbf{n}_s^* \cdot \mathbf{M}_s \cdot \mathbf{n}_s,$$

for $\mathbf{n}_s \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_s \equiv \sum_{k \in \{x,y,z\}} n_s^{(k)} \hat{\sigma}_s^k$ on qubit s, Clifford configuration $\hat{B} \equiv \hat{C}_{\vec{\alpha}}$, and matchgate circuit $\hat{U}$, can be calculated analytically by a classical computer in polynomial time in $|\vec{\alpha}|$ and circuit depth of $\hat{U}$.

The result follows from a modification of the Cauchy-Binet formula and demonstrates a surprising fact: it is not necessary to calculate the Heisenberg evolution of an observable to characterize its propagation. The analytic expression of the result as well as further details may be found in the supplementary material.

When the bound (1) holds, we can efficiently approximate the evolution in Eq. (3) by truncating the sum to those $\vec{\beta}$ whose support lies strictly within a constant subset of qubits, incurring a bounded average-case error.

Theorem 2. *(Average disturbance by truncation) Let $\mathcal{E}_s$ be the completely depolarizing channel on qubit s. The average change in expectation-value magnitude of $\hat{U}^\dagger \hat{B} \hat{U}$ under depolarization on a set of qubits S is bounded by the OTO correlator as*

$$\overline{|\langle \hat{U}^\dagger \hat{B} \hat{U} \rangle - \langle (\otimes_{s \in S} \mathcal{E}_s)[\hat{U}^\dagger \hat{B} \hat{U}] \rangle|} \leq \sum_{s \in S} \sqrt{\mathbf{n}_s^* \cdot \mathbf{M}_s \cdot \mathbf{n}_s},$$

where $\overline{(\cdot)}$ denotes an average over a product basis whose Bloch axes are orthogonal to the vectors $\{\mathbf{n}_s\}_s$, and $\mathbf{M}_s$ is as defined in Theorem 1.

Numerical example.—Theorem 1 is valid for every Hamiltonian of the form (2). However, we will simplify our numerical analysis to two specific models of the form:

$$\hat{H}(t) = \hat{H}_0 + \frac{2\Delta}{\delta t}\hat{H}_k(t),$$

where $k \in \{1, 2\}$ labels the model (we will hereafter refer to the model by its value of k). The static term $\hat{H}_0$ is the disordered XY model, given by

$$\hat{H}_0 = \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} 2\mu \left(\hat{\sigma}_j^x \hat{\sigma}_{j+1}^x + \hat{\sigma}_j^y \hat{\sigma}_{j+1}^y\right) + \sum_{j=1}^{n} 2\nu_j \hat{\sigma}_j^z,$$

where the ν_j are chosen i.i.d. from the uniform distribution over the interval $[-\nu, \nu]$ for each site j. The time-dependent $\hat{H}_k(t)$ are given by

$$\hat{H}_1(t) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \kappa_j(t)\hat{\sigma}_j^z$$
$$\hat{H}_2(t) = \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \kappa_j(t) \left(\hat{\sigma}_j^x \hat{\sigma}_{j+1}^x + \hat{\sigma}_j^y \hat{\sigma}_{j+1}^y\right),$$

where the $\kappa_j(t)$ are chosen i.i.d. from the uniform distribution over $[-1, 1]$ for each site j at regular intervals of duration δt ($\delta t = 0.25$ in our numerics). To observe the interplay between local disorder and disordered interactions, we we fix $\mu = 1$ and vary ν and Δ in Model 1, and in Model 2, we fix $\nu = 1$ and vary μ and Δ. This is intended to resemble a discrete-time control setup, wherein some of the parameters are constrained but others may be varied with control strength Δ. The static limit, for which $\Delta = 0$, is well-understood (see e.g. Ref. [24]) and will provide a convenient reference point.

In Fig. 1, we plot representative profiles of the OTO correlator (hereafter referred to as "light cones") for $\hat{B} = \hat{\sigma}_{50}^z$ (left) and $\hat{B} = \hat{\sigma}_{50}^x$ (right) for $n = 100$ in Model 1 in its ballistic (top), diffusive (middle), and localized (bottom) phases. In the localized propagation, for which $\nu = 2$ and $\Delta = 0$, the bound (1) is satisfied, and the observable support remains confined. As we increase fluctuations relative to static disorder in the middle plots, for which $\nu = 0.75$ and $\Delta = 1$, we see that time-dependent fluctuations induce a transition to diffusive propagation.

Analysis.—We characterize the propagation of $\hat{B}(t)$ by taking the singular value decomposition in discrete time

$$|||[\mathbf{n}_s \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_s, \hat{B}(t_k)]||| = \sum_j \lambda_j u_j(t_k) v_j(s),$$

where $t_k \equiv k\delta t$, and $\lambda_1 > \lambda_2 > \ldots$ for the singular values λ_j. We take the function $u_1(t)$ to represent the light cone envelope and $v_1(s)$ the decay profile of $|||[\mathbf{n}_s \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_s, \hat{B}(t)]|||$



FIG. 1: (Color online) Typical light cones for $\hat{\sigma}_{50}^z$ (left) and $\hat{\sigma}_{50}^x$ (right) propagating through the time-dependent disordered XY model with mean disorder strength ν and fluctuation strength Δ, for $n = 100$ qubits. Light cones are taken as a geometric mean (the determinant, averaged geometrically over 10 disorder realizations) to preserve exponential decay. Representatives of the ballistic ($\nu = 0$, $\Delta = 0$, top), diffusive ($\nu = 0.75$, $\Delta = 1$, middle), and localized ($\nu = 2$, $\Delta = 0$, bottom) phases are shown. We note that, while the light cone envelopes for $\hat{\sigma}_{50}^z$ and $\hat{\sigma}_{50}^x$ are always nearly the same, the interior of that for $\hat{\sigma}_{50}^x$ generally has a higher value.

outside of this envelope. This method has several advantages: (i) the principal singular value component is the closest *product* approximation to the light cone, and so has the form of the right-hand-side of (1); (ii) the singular values themselves give the error incurred in the approximation; and (iii) the principal singular value component is robust to fluctuations from specific disorder realizations, greatly reducing the number of samples needed. It therefore gives an operationally meaningful, robust, and numerically inexpensive means of extracting the envelope and decay profile, which is completely general beyond the setting of matchgate circuits considered here.

In Fig. 2, we plot the results of our analysis for the $\hat{\sigma}^x$ light cones of Fig. 1. We see that the envelopes (linear scale on top left, and log-log scale on top right) $u_1(t)$ propagate as polynomials with different exponents m, which we take to be indicative of the dynamical phases of these profiles. In Fig. 3, we plot m for $\hat{\sigma}_{50}^z$ and $\hat{\sigma}_{50}^x$ for our



FIG. 2: (Color online) (Top, left) Envelopes of the $\hat{\sigma}^x$ light cones in Fig. 1, given by the principal temporal components of their singular value decompositions. (Top, right) Envelopes on a log-log plot, with fitted slopes displayed. Note the saturation of the ballistic case around $t \simeq 6$ is a boundary effect; otherwise, it is expected to be a straight slope. (Bottom, left) Singular values in these decompositions on log-log scale, which demonstrate the error in truncating to a product function; we see that these decay by several orders of magnitude over the first ten. (Bottom, right) Light cone decay profiles, given by the principal spatial vectors; these profiles are very nearly Gaussian, rather than exponential.



FIG. 3: (Color online) Phase diagrams for the propagation of $\hat{\sigma}^z$ (left) and $\hat{\sigma}^x$ (right) in the presence of locally fluctuating disorder (top) and fluctuating interactions (bottom). These are given by taking the fitted slopes m of the light cone envelopes. Though this parameter is continuous, we see that several natural regions emerge: ballistic ($m \approx 1$), diffusive ($m \approx 0.5$), and localized ($m \approx 0$). Numbered points correspond to the corresponding light cones in Fig. 1, where points (1) and (3) on the y-axis meant to be located at $\Delta = 0$. The extended localized phase demonstrates that localization survives under weak fluctuations.

two models for $n = 100$, as in Fig. 1, as phase diagrams. We identify the *ballistic* phase with regions where m is very nearly one, the *localized* phase with regions where m is very nearly zero, and the *diffusive* phase with regions where m is nearly 0.5. With this identification, we see that as $\Delta \to 0$, our results agree with the known limit of static local disorder in Model 1. Similarly, as Δ becomes large, we see the emergence of a diffusive phase, which is consistent with the results put forth in [27]. Finally, we see that, for small $\Delta \neq 0$, the localized phase survives. This indicates the existence of new matchgate circuits for which localization may be applied to classically simulate $\langle \hat{U}^\dagger \hat{\sigma}^x_k \hat{U} \rangle$ for arbitrary k in a general product state input.

One advantage of our method is that it gives the *interior* of the light cone in addition to its envelope. In each phase, we see that the light cone interior for $\hat{\sigma}^x_{50}$ generally has a higher value than that for $\hat{\sigma}^z_{50}$. This is a consistent difference between the profiles of these operators, which may have important consequences for scrambling [46]. We attribute the emergence of a near-ballistic region in the $\hat{\sigma}^x$ phase diagram of Model 2, which is absent from the $\hat{\sigma}^z$ diagram, to this observation. Though some amplitude propagates ballistically for both observables in this region, this only manifests as a spreading of the exponential tails for $\hat{\sigma}^z$. For $\hat{\sigma}^x$ however, this is exhibited as a ballistic spreading of the high-amplitude region due to interference between its many constituent Clifford operators. This indicates that, at least in the presence of fluctuating interactions, propagation behavior between different local operators can be strikingly different.

Discussion.—We have presented examples where localization may be applied as a tool for classically simulating quantum circuits which were a priori believed to be classically intractable. This is achieved by an analytic calculation of the OTO correlator (presented in Appendix D), followed by truncation to a subset of qubits for which this quantity falls below a certain threshold. Although we chose here so-called matchgate circuits related to the time evolution of free fermions because of its correspondence to Anderson localization, our method is expected to have further applications and extensions. On the former, for example, one may apply it to other random-circuit ensembles, such as those with Haar random gates, to study scrambling in general. A preliminary analysis indicates that propagation in this case seems to scale logarithmically, rather than polynomially. On the latter, it may be feasible to extend ours to analyze universal quantum computation, by considering matchgate circuits acting on certain entangled input states of Ref. [33] because our method is independent of the input. In a similar way as Anderson localization has been extended to many-body localization, certain perturbative analysis (in analogy to that performed in [58] for Clifford circuits) could probe possible dynamical localization in general quantum circuits as well as simulating interacting fermions.

This work was supported in part by National Science Foundation grants PHY-1521016.

* Electronic address: akchapman@unm.edu
† Electronic address: amiyake@unm.edu

[1] P. W. Anderson, "Absence of diffusion in certain random lattices," Phys. Rev. **109**, 1492 (1958).
[2] Y. Lahini, Y. Bromberg, D. N. Christodoulides, and Y. Silberberg, "Quantum correlations in two-particle anderson localization," Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 163905 (2010).
[3] E. Abrahams, *50 years of Anderson localization*, World Scientific, (Singapore) (2010).
[4] A. Crespi, R. Osellame, R. Ramponi, V. Giovannetti, R. Fazio, L. Sansoni, F. De Nicola, F. Sciarrino, and P. Mataloni, "Anderson localization of entangled photons in an integrated quantum walk," Nat. Photon. **7**, 322-328 (2013).
[5] I. V. Gornyi, A. D. Mirlin, and D. G. Polyakov, "Interacting electrons in disordered wires: Anderson localization and low-T transport," Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 206603 (2005).
[6] D. M. Basko, I. L. Aleiner, and B. L. Altshuler, "Metal-insulator transition in a weakly interacting many-electron system with localized single-particle states," Ann. Phys. **321**, 1126 (2006).
[7] V. Oganesyan and D. Huse, "Localization of interacting fermions at high temperature," Phys. Rev. B **75**, 155111 (2007).
[8] A. Pal and D. A. Huse, "Many-body localization phase transition," Phys. Rev. B **82**, 174411 (2010).
[9] R. Vosk and E. Altman, "Dynamical quantum phase transitions in random spin chains," Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 217204 (2014).
[10] Y. B. Lev, G. Cohen, and D. R. Reichman, "Absence of diffusion in an interacting system of spinless fermions on a one-dimensional disordered lattice," Phys. Rev. Lett. **114**, 100601 (2015).
[11] S. Bera, H. Schomerus, F. Heidrich-Meisner, and J. H. Bardarson, "Many-body localization characterized from a one-particle perspective," Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, 046603 (2015).
[12] J. Deutsch, "Quantum statistical mechanics in a closed system," Phys. Rev. A **43**, 2046 (1991).
[13] A. Pal, *Many-body localization*, Diss. Princeton University (2012).
[14] D. Huse, R. Nandkishore, V. Oganesyan, A. Pal, and S. Sondhi, "Localization-protected quantum order," Phys. Rev. B **88**, 014206 (2013).
[15] J. A. Kjäll, J. H. Bardarson, and F. Pollmann, "Many-body localization in a disordered quantum ising chain," Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 107204 (2014).
[16] R. Nandkishore and D. Huse, "Many-body localization and thermalization in quantum statistical mechanics," Ann. Rev. Cond. Mat. Phys. **6**, 15-38 (2015).
[17] I. H. Kim, A. Chandran, and D. A. Abanin, "Local integrals of motion and the logarithmic lightcone in many-body localized systems," arXiv:1412.3073 [cond-mat.dis-nn] (2014).
[18] Y.-Z. You, X.-L. Qi, and C. Xu, "Entanglement holographic mapping of many-body localized system by spectrum bifurcation renormalization group," Phys. Rev. B **93**, 104205 (2016).
[19] B. Bauer and C. Nayak, "Area laws in a many-body localized state and its implications for topological order," J. Stat. Mech. P09005 (2013).
[20] M. Friesdorf, A. H. Werner, W. Brown, V. B. Scholz, and J. Eisert, "Many-body localization implies that eigenvectors are matrix-product states," Phys. Rev. Lett. **114**, 170505 (2015).
[21] Y. Huang, "Efficient simulation of many-body localized systems," arXiv:1508.04756 [cond-mat.dis-nn] (2015).
[22] X. Yu, D. Pekker, and B. K. Clark, "Finding matrix product state representations of highly-excited eigenstates of many-body localized Hamiltonians," arXiv:1509.01244 [cond-mat.str-el] (2015).
[23] F. Pollmann, V. Khemani, J. I. Cirac, and S. L. Sondhi, "Efficient variational diagonalization of fully many-body localized Hamiltonians," Phys. Rev. B **94**, 041116 (2016).
[24] C. K. Burrell and T. J. Osborne, "Bounds on the speed of information propagation in disordered quantum spin chains," Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 167201 (2007).
[25] M. Žnidarič, T. c. v. Prosen, and P. Prelovšek, "Many-body localization in the Heisenberg XXZ magnet in a random field," Phys. Rev. B **77**, 064426 (2008).
[26] A. Deshpande, B. Fefferman, M. Foss-Feig, and A. V. Gorshkov, "Complexity of sampling as an order parameter," arXiv:1703.05332 [quant-ph] (2017).
[27] C. K. Burrell, J. Eisert, and T. J. Osborne, "Information propagation through quantum chains with fluctuating disorder," Phys. Rev. A **80**, 052319 (2009).
[28] K. Sacha and D. Delande, "Anderson localization in the time domain," Phys. Rev. A **94**, 023633 (2016).
[29] A. Chandran and C. R. Laumann, "A semi-classical limit for the many-body localization transition," Phys. Rev. B **92**, 024301 (2015).
[30] E. Knill, "Fermionic linear optics and matchgates," arXiv:0108033 [quant-ph] (2001).
[31] B. M. Terhal and D. P. DiVincenzo, "Classical simulation of noninteracting-fermion quantum circuits," Phys. Rev. A **65**, 032325 (2002).
[32] S. Bravyi and A. Kitaev, "Fermionic quantum computation," Ann. Phys. **298**, 210-226 (2002).
[33] S. Bravyi, "Universal quantum computation with the $\nu = 5/2$ fractional quantum hall state," Phys. Rev. A **73**, 042313 (2006).
[34] R. Jozsa and A. Miyake, "Matchgates and classical simulation of quantum circuits," Proc. R. Soc. A **464**, 3089 (2008).
[35] F. Melo, P. Ćwikliński, and B. M. Terhal, "The power of noisy fermionic quantum computation," New J. Phys. **13**, 013015 (2013).
[36] D. J. Brod and A. Childs, "The computational power of matchgates and the XY interaction on arbitrary graphs," Quant. Info. Comp. **14**, 901-916 (2014).
[37] D. J. Brod, "Efficient classical simulation of matchgate circuits with generalized inputs and measurements," Phys. Rev. A **93**, 062332 (2016).
[38] E. Hamza, R. Sims, and G. Stolz, "Dynamical localization in disordered quantum spin systems," Commun. Math. Phys. **315**, 215-239 (2012).
[39] E. Lieb and D. Robinson, "The finite group velocity of quantum spin systems," Comm. Math. Phys. **28**, 251-257 (1972).
[40] B. Nachtergaele and R. Sims, "Lieb-Robinson bounds and the exponential clustering theorem," Comm. Math. Phys. **265**, 119-130 (2006).
[41] M. B. Hastings and T. Koma, "Spectral gap and expo-

nential decay of correlations," Comm. Math. Phys. **265**, 781-804 (2006).

[42] B. Nachtergaele and R. Sims, "Lieb-Robinson bounds in quantum many-body physics," Contem. Math. **529**, 141-176 (2010).

[43] S. Bravyi, M. B. Hastings, and F. Verstraete, "Lieb-Robinson bounds and the generation of correlations and topological quantum order," Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 050401 (2006).

[44] J. Maldecena, S. H. Shenker, and D. Stanford, "A bound on chaos," J. High Energ. Phys. (2016) 2016:106.

[45] I. L. Aleiner, "Microscopic model of quantum butterfly effect: out-of-time-order correlators and traveling combustion waves," Ann. Phys. **375**, 378-406 (2016).

[46] D. A. Roberts, B. Yoshida, "Chaos and complexity by design," aXiv:1610.049031 [quant-ph] (2016).

[47] N. Y. Halpern, "Jarzynski-like equality for the out-of-time-ordered correlator," Phys. Rev. A **95**, 012120 (2017).

[48] J. S. Cotler, D. Ding, and G. R. Penington, "Out-of-time-order operators and the butterfly effect," arXiv:1704.02979 [quant-ph] (2017).

[49] S. H. Shenker and D. Stanford, "Black holes and the butterfly effect," J. High. Energ. Phys. (2014) 2014:67.

[50] A. Kitaev, "Hidden Correlations in the Hawking Radiation and Thermal Noise," talk given at Fundamental Physics Prize Symposium, Nov. 10, 2014. Stanford SITP seminars, Nov. 11 and Dec. 18, 2014.

[51] A. Kitaev, "A simple model of quantum holography," KITP strings seminar and Entanglement 2015 program, Feb. 12, April 7, and May 27, 2015.

[52] D. A. Roberts, D. Stanford, and L. Susskind, "Localized shocks," J. High. Energ. Phys. (2015) 2015:51.

[53] R. Fan, P. Zhang, H. Shen, and H. Zhai, "Out-of-time-order correlation for many-body localization," arXiv:1608.01914 [cond-mat.quant-gas] (2016).

[54] Y. Chen, "Universal logarithmic scrambling in many body localization," arXiv:1608.02765 [cond-mat.dis-nn] (2016).

[55] B. Swingle and D. Chowdhury, "Slow scrambling in disordered quantum systems," arXiv:1608.03280 [cond-mat.str-el] (2016).

[56] R.-Q. He and Z.-Y. Lu, "Characterizing many-body localization by out-of-time-ordered correlation," arXiv:1608.03586 [cond-mat.dis-nn] (2016).

[57] Y. Huang, Y.-L. Zhang, and X. Chen, "Out-of-time-ordered correlators in many-body localized systems," Ann. Phys. (Berlin), doi:10.1002/andp.201600318 (2016).

[58] S. Bravyi and D. Gosset, "Improved classical simulation of quantum circuits dominated by clifford gates," Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 250501 (2016).

Supplementary Material for "Classical simulation of quantum circuits by dynamical localization: analytic results for Pauli-observable propagation in time-dependent disorder"

OUTLINE OF SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

In the following sections, we prove Theorems 1 and 2 in the main text. In the first section, we show that the transition amplitudes between Clifford configuration operators – ordered products of Clifford operators – under matchgate evolution are given by determinants of submatrices of the single-Clifford transition matrix. Next, we show a modification to the Cauchy-Binet formula to compute sums of only those configuration transition amplitudes which involve a fixed background of Clifford operators. In Appendix C, we apply this formula to compute a sum of only those configuration transition amplitudes which involve a fixed parity on a given subset. Finally, we use the results of Appendices A-C to arrive at our analytic calculation of the infinite temperature OTO correlator (Theorem 1). In Appendix E, we prove a bound on the average-case change in expectation value induced by the depolarizing channel in terms of this quantity (Theorem 2).

SUMMARY OF NOTATION

$\vec{\alpha}$	$\equiv$	$(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \ldots, \alpha_k)$, where $\alpha_j < \alpha_{j+1}$, for all $\alpha_j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, N\}$ for some $N \in \mathbb{N}$, and $j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, k-1\}$; i.e. an *ordered tuple* of indices.
$\lvert\vec{\alpha}\rvert$	$\equiv$	k, the number of elements in the tuple $\vec{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \ldots, \alpha_k)$.
$[k]$	$\equiv$	$(1, 2, \ldots, k)$, the particular tuple consisting of consecutive integers from 1 to k.
$\overline{\alpha}$	$\equiv$	Ordered tuple of indices in the set-complement of $\vec{\alpha}$ in $[N]$.
$()$	$\equiv$	The empty tuple, for which $\lvert()\rvert = 0$.
$\vec{\alpha} \cup \vec{\beta}$	$\equiv$	Ordered tuple of all indices in either $\vec{\alpha}$ or $\vec{\beta}$.
$\vec{\alpha} \subset \vec{\beta}$	$\equiv$	$\vec{\alpha}$ is an ordered tuple of indices $\alpha_j \in \vec{\beta}$ for all $j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, \lvert\vec{\alpha}\rvert < \lvert\vec{\beta}\rvert\}$.
$\vec{\alpha} \backslash \alpha_j$	$\equiv$	Ordered tuple of indices from $\vec{\alpha}$ with the particular element α_j removed.
$(\vec{\alpha}, \vec{\beta})$	$\equiv$	$(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \ldots, \alpha_k, \beta_1, \beta_2, \ldots)$; i.e. the unordered concatenation of $\vec{\alpha}$ and $\vec{\beta}$.
$\hat{C}_{\vec{\alpha}}$	$\equiv$	$\mathcal{P} \prod_{j=1}^{\lvert\vec{\alpha}\rvert} \hat{c}_{\alpha_j}$, the product of Clifford operators with indices in ascending order, called a *Clifford configuration operator*.
$\mathbf{u}_{\vec{\alpha}\vec{\beta}}$	$\equiv$	Submatrix $\mathbf{u}_{\vec{\alpha}\vec{\beta}}$ of $\mathbf{u}$, with row indices from $\vec{\alpha}$ and column indices from $\vec{\beta}$; i.e. $\left(\mathbf{u}_{\vec{\alpha}\vec{\beta}}\right)_{jk} = u_{\alpha_j \beta_k}$.

Additionally, when we say we have a matchgate unitary $\hat{U} \equiv \exp\left(-\sum_{\mu,\nu=1}^{2n} h_{\mu\nu} \hat{c}_\mu \hat{c}_\nu\right)$ on n qubits for some antisymmetric matrix $\mathbf{h}$, we associate it with the $2n \times 2n$ orthogonal matrix $\mathbf{u} \equiv e^{4\mathbf{h}} \in \mathbf{SO}(2n)$ by the corresponding lowercase symbol in bold. We also denote block matrices in the usual way [e.g. $\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{A} & \mathbf{B} \\ \mathbf{C} & \mathbf{D} \end{pmatrix}$].

APPENDIX A: CLIFFORD CONFIGURATION OPERATOR TRANSITION AMPLITUDES

Here we prove the formula

$$\hat{U}^\dagger \hat{C}_{\vec{\alpha}} \hat{U} = \sum_{\{\vec{\beta} \mid \lvert\vec{\beta}\rvert = \lvert\vec{\alpha}\rvert\}} \det\left(\mathbf{u}_{\vec{\alpha}\vec{\beta}}\right) \hat{C}_{\vec{\beta}}, \tag{S1}$$

for some matchgate unitary $\hat{U}$, by induction on the number of Clifford factors $k \equiv \lvert\vec{\alpha}\rvert$. First consider the case where $k = 2$, and let $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2$. We have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\hat{U}^\dagger \hat{c}_{\alpha_1}\hat{c}_{\alpha_2}\hat{U} &= \left(\hat{U}^\dagger \hat{c}_{\alpha_1}\hat{U}\right)\left(\hat{U}^\dagger \hat{c}_{\alpha_2}\hat{U}\right) \\
&= \left(\sum_{\beta_1} u_{\alpha_1\beta_1}\hat{c}_{\beta_1}\right)\left(\sum_{\beta_2} u_{\alpha_2\beta_2}\hat{c}_{\beta_2}\right) \\
&= \left(\sum_{\{(\beta_1,\beta_2)|\beta_1=\beta_2\}} + \sum_{\{(\beta_1,\beta_2)|\beta_1<\beta_2\}} + \sum_{\{(\beta_1,\beta_2)|\beta_1>\beta_2\}}\right) u_{\alpha_1\beta_1}u_{\alpha_2\beta_2}\hat{c}_{\beta_1}\hat{c}_{\beta_2} \\
&= \left(\sum_{\beta_1} u_{\alpha_1\beta_1}u_{\alpha_2\beta_1}\right)\hat{\mathbb{1}} + \sum_{\{(\beta_1,\beta_2)|\beta_1<\beta_2\}} \left(u_{\alpha_1\beta_1}u_{\alpha_2\beta_2} - u_{\alpha_1\beta_2}u_{\alpha_2\beta_1}\right)\hat{c}_{\beta_1}\hat{c}_{\beta_2} \\
&= \sum_{\{(\beta_1,\beta_2)|\beta_1<\beta_2\}} \det\left[\mathbf{u}_{(\alpha_1,\alpha_2)(\beta_1,\beta_2)}\right]\hat{c}_{\beta_1}\hat{c}_{\beta_2}
\end{aligned}
,
$$

where, from the third to the fourth line, we used the Clifford algebra anticommutation relations

$$\{\hat{c}_\mu, \hat{c}_\nu\} = 2\delta_{\mu\nu}\hat{\mathbb{1}},$$

relabeling dummy indices $\beta_1 \leftrightarrow \beta_2$ on the third sum in line 3. From the fourth to the fifth line, we see that the identity term vanishes as its coefficient is the inner product between two distinct row vectors of an orthogonal matrix. This proves the statement for $k = 2$. Next, we assume the statement holds for general k and use this assumption to prove the statement for $k+1$. Without loss of generality, assume $\alpha_j < \alpha_{k+1}$ for all $j \leq k$. We now have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\hat{U}^\dagger \hat{C}_{\vec{\alpha}}\hat{c}_{\alpha_{k+1}}\hat{U} &= \left(\hat{U}^\dagger \hat{C}_{\vec{\alpha}}\hat{U}\right)\left(\hat{U}^\dagger \hat{c}_{\alpha_{k+1}}\hat{U}\right) \\
&= \left[\sum_{\{\vec{\beta}||\vec{\beta}|=|\vec{\alpha}|\}} \det\left(\mathbf{u}_{\vec{\alpha}\vec{\beta}}\right)\hat{C}_{\vec{\beta}}\right]\left(\sum_{\beta_{k+1}} u_{\alpha_{k+1}\beta_{k+1}}\hat{c}_{\beta_{k+1}}\right) \\
\hat{U}^\dagger \hat{C}_{\vec{\alpha}}\hat{c}_{\alpha_{k+1}}\hat{U} &= \sum_{\{(\vec{\beta},\beta_{k+1})||\vec{\beta}|=|\vec{\alpha}|\}} u_{\alpha_{k+1}\beta_{k+1}} \det\left(\mathbf{u}_{\vec{\alpha}\vec{\beta}}\right)\hat{C}_{\vec{\beta}}\hat{c}_{\beta_{k+1}}
\end{aligned}
\tag{S2}
$$

Each of the terms in the sum above falls into one of two categories. Either (i) $\beta_{k+1} \in \vec{\beta}$, and $\hat{C}_{\vec{\beta}}\hat{c}_{\beta_{k+1}} = \pm\hat{C}_{\vec{\beta}\setminus\beta_{k+1}}$, or (ii) $\beta_{k+1} \notin \vec{\beta}$, and $\hat{C}_{\vec{\beta}}\hat{c}_{\beta_{k+1}} = \pm\hat{C}_{\vec{\beta}\cup\beta_{k+1}}$, with sign given in both cases by $(-1)^{|\{j\leq k|\beta_j>\beta_{k+1}\}|}$. We first proceed to demonstrate that all of the terms in category (i) vanish. Fix a particular configuration operator $\hat{C}_{\vec{\beta}\setminus\beta_{k+1}}$. The coefficient on this operator in the r.h.s. of Eq. (S2) is given by a sum over all indices γ which could have been removed from $\vec{\beta}$ to yield $\vec{\beta}\setminus\beta_{k+1}$

$$\sum_{\gamma\notin\vec{\beta}\setminus\beta_{k+1}} u_{\alpha_{k+1}\gamma}\det\left[\mathbf{u}_{\vec{\alpha}(\vec{\beta}\setminus\beta_{k+1},\gamma)}\right] = \sum_{\gamma} u_{\alpha_{k+1}\gamma}\det\left[\mathbf{u}_{\vec{\alpha}(\vec{\beta}\setminus\beta_{k+1},\gamma)}\right],$$

where we were able to cancel any sign factors on the terms inside the sum by reordering columns in $\mathbf{u}$ so that the γ column appears at the rightmost position, using the alternating sign property of the determinant. The equality is due to the fact that if $\gamma \in \vec{\beta}\setminus\beta_{k+1}$, then the determinant in that term evaluates to zero. Finally, we use the multilinearity property of the determinant to bring the sum on to the last column, as

$$\sum_{\gamma} u_{\alpha_{k+1}\gamma}\det\left[\mathbf{u}_{\vec{\alpha}(\vec{\beta}\setminus\beta_{k+1},\gamma)}\right] = \det\left[\begin{pmatrix}\mathbf{u}_{\vec{\alpha},\vec{\beta}\setminus\beta_{k+1}} & \sum_\gamma u_{\alpha_{k+1}\gamma}\mathbf{u}_{\vec{\alpha}\gamma}\end{pmatrix}\right], \tag{S3}$$

i.e. the determinant of a matrix whose last column vector is $\sum_\gamma u_{\alpha_{k+1}\gamma}\mathbf{u}_{\vec{\alpha}\gamma}$. The lth element of this column is given by

$$\sum_{\gamma} u_{\alpha_{k+1}\gamma} u_{\alpha_l \gamma} = \delta_{\alpha_{k+1}\alpha_l}$$

again following from the fact that this sum is the inner product between two column vectors of an orthogonal matrix. However, $\alpha_{k+1} > \alpha_l$ by assumption, so this sum is actually always zero and the determinant in (S3) vanishes. Each of the terms in category (i) therefore vanishes, and the only terms in the r.h.s of Eq. (S2) that survive are in category (ii). We examine these terms by next fixing a particular configuration operator $\hat{C}_{\vec{\beta}\cup\beta_{k+1}}$. The coefficient on this operator in the r.h.s. of (S2) is given by a sum over all indices γ that could have been added to $\vec{\beta}$ to yield $\vec{\beta}\cup\beta_{k+1}$ (we cannot cancel sign factors this time)

$$\sum_{\gamma\in\vec{\beta}\cup\beta_{k+1}} (-1)^{|\{j\leq k+1|\beta_j>\gamma\}|} u_{\alpha_{k+1}\gamma} \det\left[\mathbf{u}_{\vec{\alpha},(\vec{\beta}\cup\beta_{k+1})\setminus\gamma}\right] = \det\left[\mathbf{u}_{(\vec{\alpha},\alpha_{k+1}),\vec{\beta}\cup\beta_{k+1}}\right].$$

To see that this equality indeed holds, relabel indices in $\vec{\beta}\cup\beta_{k+1}$ such that $\beta_i < \beta_{i+1}$ for all $i \leq k$, and suppose $\gamma = \beta_s$ in this labeling. Then we have

$$(-1)^{|\{j\leq k+1|\beta_j>\gamma\}|} = (-1)^{(k+1)-s} = (-1)^{(k+1)+s}$$

As $\alpha_j < \alpha_{k+1}$ for all $j \leq k$, this is exactly the sign factor that would appear had we expanded along the last [$(k+1)$st] row of the matrix in the r.h.s. above, since β_s appears as the sth column of this matrix. We therefore have

$$\hat{U}^\dagger \hat{C}_{\vec{\alpha}} \hat{c}_{\alpha_{k+1}} \hat{U} = \sum_{\{\vec{\beta}||\vec{\beta}|=k+1\}} \det\left[\mathbf{u}_{(\vec{\alpha},\alpha_{k+1})\vec{\beta}}\right] \hat{C}_{\vec{\beta}},$$

which proves the statement for $k+1$, given that it holds for k. This completes our inductive proof of Eq. (S1). □

APPENDIX B: MODIFIED CAUCHY-BINET FORMULA

Here we prove

$$\sum_{\{\vec{\beta}\subset\vec{B}||\vec{\beta}|=|\vec{\alpha}|-|\vec{S}|\}} \det\left(\mathbf{u}_{\vec{\alpha},\vec{\beta}\cup\vec{S}}\right) \det\left(\mathbf{v}_{\vec{\alpha},\vec{\beta}\cup\vec{S}}\right) = (-1)^{|\vec{S}|} \det\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{|\vec{S}|\times|\vec{S}|} & \mathbf{v}^{\mathrm{T}}_{\vec{S}\vec{\alpha}} \\ \mathbf{u}_{\vec{\alpha}\vec{S}} & \mathbf{u}_{\vec{\alpha}\vec{B}}\mathbf{v}^{\mathrm{T}}_{\vec{B}\vec{\alpha}} \end{pmatrix} \tag{S4}$$

for $\vec{S}$ disjoint from $\vec{B}$. We first rearrange rows and columns inside the matrices $\mathbf{u}$ and $\mathbf{v}$ in the l.h.s. of (S4) to bring each of them to a fiducial form, $\mathbf{u}'$ and $\mathbf{v}'$, respectively. These are such that $\mathbf{u}'_{\vec{\alpha}'\vec{S}'} = \mathbf{u}_{\vec{\alpha}\vec{S}}$ and $\mathbf{u}'_{\vec{\alpha}'\vec{B}'} = \mathbf{u}_{\vec{\alpha}\vec{B}}$ (and similarly for $\mathbf{v}'$), for $\vec{\alpha}' \equiv [|\vec{\alpha}|]$ and $\vec{S}' \equiv [|\vec{S}|]$. That is, we bring the rows $\vec{\alpha}$ to the top and the columns $\vec{S}$ to the left inside the matrices $\mathbf{u}$ and $\mathbf{v}$ without changing the internal ordering of these tuples, nor the ordering of $\vec{B}$. This is done purely for convenience of presentation and will not affect the argument, as we will undo the rearrangement in the end. We will continue to refer to the numbers of elements in these rearranged tuples by those of their unprimed counterparts (i.e. using $|\vec{S}|$ instead of $|\vec{S}'|$), as they are equal. Since this rearrangement is done for both $\mathbf{u}$ and $\mathbf{v}$, any resulting sign factor acquired due to the alternating sign property of the determinant will cancel in the product, and we have

$$\sum_{\{\vec{\beta}\subset\vec{B}||\vec{\beta}|=|\vec{\alpha}|-|\vec{S}|\}} \det\left(\mathbf{u}_{\vec{\alpha},\vec{\beta}\cup\vec{S}}\right) \det\left(\mathbf{v}_{\vec{\alpha},\vec{\beta}\cup\vec{S}}\right) = \sum_{\{\vec{\beta}\subset\vec{B}'||\vec{\beta}|=|\vec{\alpha}|-|\vec{S}|\}} \det\left[\mathbf{u}'_{\vec{\alpha}'(\vec{S}',\vec{\beta})}\right] \det\left[\mathbf{v}'_{\vec{\alpha}'(\vec{S}',\vec{\beta})}\right], \tag{S5}$$

We will next need the Laplace "expansion by complimentary minors" formula

$$\det\left(\mathbf{u}\right) = \sum_{\{\vec{H}||\vec{H}|=k\}} \varepsilon^{\vec{H},\vec{L}} \det\left(\mathbf{u}_{\vec{H}\vec{L}}\right) \det\left(\mathbf{u}_{\overline{H}\overline{L}}\right), \tag{S6}$$

where $\varepsilon^{\vec{H},\vec{L}} = (-1)^{\sum_{j=1}^{k}(H_j+L_j)}$, $\vec{L}$ is a fixed subset of the columns of $\mathbf{u}$ of size k, the sum is over all subsets $\vec{H}$ of rows of $\mathbf{u}$ of size k, and $\overline{L}$ and $\overline{H}$ are the set-complements of $\vec{L}$ and $\vec{H}$ in the sets of all columns and rows of $\mathbf{u}$, respectively. This is the analogous formula to expanding the determinant by minors of a fixed column, generalized to a subset of columns $\vec{L}$. Applying Eq. (S6) to the columns $\vec{S}'$ of $\mathbf{u}'$ and $\mathbf{v}'$ on the r.h.s. of (S5) gives

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\{\vec{\beta}\subset\vec{B}||\vec{\beta}|=|\vec{\alpha}|-|\vec{S}|\}} \det\left(\mathbf{u}_{\vec{\alpha},\vec{\beta}\cup\vec{S}}\right) \det\left(\mathbf{v}_{\vec{\alpha},\vec{\beta}\cup\vec{S}}\right) &= \sum_{\{\vec{\beta}\subset\vec{B}'||\vec{\beta}|=|\vec{\alpha}|-|\vec{S}|\}} \left[\sum_{\{\vec{H}\subset\vec{\alpha}'||\vec{H}|=|\vec{S}|\}} \varepsilon^{\vec{H},\vec{S}'} \det\left(\mathbf{u}'_{\vec{H}\vec{S}'}\right) \det\left(\mathbf{u}'_{\vec{\alpha}'\setminus\vec{H},\vec{\beta}}\right)\right] \\ &\quad\times \left[\sum_{\{\vec{L}\subset\vec{\alpha}'||\vec{L}|=|\vec{S}|\}} \varepsilon^{\vec{L},\vec{S}'} \det\left(\mathbf{v}'_{\vec{L}\vec{S}'}\right) \det\left(\mathbf{v}'_{\vec{\alpha}'\setminus\vec{L},\vec{\beta}}\right)\right] \\ &= \sum_{\substack{\{\vec{H}\subset\vec{\alpha}'||\vec{H}|=|\vec{S}|\}\\ \{\vec{L}\subset\vec{\alpha}'||\vec{L}|=|\vec{S}|\}}} \varepsilon^{\vec{S}',\vec{S}}\varepsilon^{\vec{L},\vec{S}'} \det\left(\mathbf{u}'_{\vec{H}\vec{S}'}\right) \det\left(\mathbf{v}'_{\vec{L}\vec{S}'}\right) \\ &\quad\times \left[\sum_{\{\vec{\beta}\subset\vec{B}'||\vec{\beta}|=|\vec{\alpha}|-|\vec{S}|\}} \det\left(\mathbf{u}'_{\vec{\alpha}'\setminus\vec{H},\vec{\beta}}\right) \det\left(\mathbf{v}'_{\vec{\alpha}'\setminus\vec{L},\vec{\beta}}\right)\right].\end{aligned}$$

We next apply the Cauchy-Binet formula to the sum in square brackets, as

$$\sum_{\{\vec{\beta}\subset\vec{B}'||\vec{\beta}|=|\vec{\alpha}|-|\vec{S}|\}} \det\left(\mathbf{u}'_{\vec{\alpha}'\setminus\vec{H},\vec{\beta}}\right) \det\left(\mathbf{v}'_{\vec{\alpha}'\setminus\vec{L},\vec{\beta}}\right) = \det\left(\mathbf{u}'_{\vec{\alpha}'\setminus\vec{H},\vec{B}'}\mathbf{v}'^{\mathrm{T}}_{\vec{B}',\vec{\alpha}'\setminus\vec{L}}\right).$$

Notice that the matrix in the determinant of the r.h.s. above is simply $\mathbf{u}'_{\vec{\alpha}',\vec{B}'}\mathbf{v}'^{\mathrm{T}}_{\vec{B}'\vec{\alpha}'}$ with the rows $\vec{H}$ and columns $\vec{L}$ removed (i.e. instead of removing the rows and columns and then multiplying, we can multiply and then remove rows and columns from the product). This gives

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\{\vec{\beta}\subset\vec{B}||\vec{\beta}|=|\vec{\alpha}|-|\vec{S}|\}} \det\left(\mathbf{u}_{\vec{\alpha},\vec{\beta}\cup\vec{S}}\right) \det\left(\mathbf{v}_{\vec{\alpha},\vec{\beta}\cup\vec{S}}\right) &= \sum_{\substack{\{\vec{H}\subset\vec{\alpha}'||\vec{H}|=|\vec{S}|\}\\ \{\vec{L}\subset\vec{\alpha}'||\vec{L}|=|\vec{S}|\}}} \varepsilon^{\vec{H},\vec{S}'}\varepsilon^{\vec{L},\vec{S}'} \det\left(\mathbf{u}'_{\vec{H}\vec{S}'}\right) \det\left(\mathbf{v}'_{\vec{L}\vec{S}'}\right) \\ &\quad\times \det\left[\left(\mathbf{u}'_{\vec{\alpha}'\vec{B}'}\mathbf{v}'^{\mathrm{T}}_{\vec{B}'\vec{\alpha}'}\right)_{\vec{\alpha}'\setminus\vec{H},\vec{\alpha}'\setminus\vec{L}}\right].\end{aligned} \tag{S7}$$

The next step is to "put back in" the rows $\vec{H}$ and columns $\vec{L}$. We do this by treating (S7) as an expansion of the determinant of a larger matrix by complimentary minors of rows $\mathbf{v}'^{\mathrm{T}}_{\vec{S}'\vec{\alpha}'}$ and then columns $\mathbf{u}'_{\vec{\alpha}'\vec{S}'}$. Working backwards, we see that the sum over $\vec{H}$ in Eq. (S7) evaluates to

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{\{\vec{H}\subset\vec{\alpha}'||\vec{H}|=|\vec{S}|\}} \varepsilon^{\vec{H},\vec{S}'} \det\left(\mathbf{u}'_{\vec{H}\vec{S}'}\right) \det\left[\left(\mathbf{u}'_{\vec{\alpha}'\vec{B}'}\mathbf{v}'^{\mathrm{T}}_{\vec{B}'\vec{\alpha}'}\right)_{\vec{\alpha}'\setminus\vec{H},\vec{\alpha}'\setminus\vec{L}}\right] \\ &\qquad = \det\left[\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{u}'_{\vec{\alpha}'\vec{S}'} & \left(\mathbf{u}'_{\vec{\alpha}'\vec{B}'}\mathbf{v}'^{\mathrm{T}}_{\vec{B}'\vec{\alpha}'}\right)_{\vec{\alpha}',\vec{\alpha}'\setminus\vec{L}} \end{pmatrix}\right]\end{aligned}$$

To put the rows back in, we note that

$$\det\left(\mathbf{v}'_{\vec{L}\vec{S}'}\right) = \det\left(\mathbf{v}'^{\mathrm{T}}_{\vec{S}'\vec{L}}\right) = (-1)^{|\vec{S}|} \det\left[\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{|\vec{S}|\times|\vec{S}|} & \mathbf{v}'^{\mathrm{T}}_{\vec{S}'\vec{\alpha}'} \end{pmatrix}_{\vec{S}',\vec{L}'}\right], \tag{S8}$$

where $\vec{L}'$ is related to $\vec{L}$ by $L'_j = L_j + |\vec{S}|$ for all $j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, |\vec{L}| = |\vec{S}|\}$. Shifting the columns over by $|\vec{S}|$ inside the determinant gives the overall factor of $(-1)^{|\vec{S}|}$. Thus, the sum over $\vec{L}$ in Eq. (S7) evaluates to

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{\{\vec{L}\subset\vec{\alpha}'||\vec{L}|=|\vec{S}|\}} \varepsilon^{\vec{L},\vec{S}'} \det\left(\mathbf{v}'_{\vec{L}\vec{S}'}\right) \det\left[\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{u}'_{\vec{\alpha}'\vec{S}'} & \left(\mathbf{u}'_{\vec{\alpha}'\vec{B}'}\mathbf{v}'^{\mathrm{T}}_{\vec{B}'\vec{\alpha}'}\right)_{\vec{\alpha}',\vec{\alpha}'\setminus\vec{L}} \end{pmatrix}\right] \\
&\qquad = (-1)^{|\vec{S}|} \sum_{\{\vec{L}\subset[|\vec{\alpha}|+|\vec{S}|]||\vec{L}|=|\vec{S}|\}} \varepsilon^{\vec{L},\vec{S}'} \det\left[\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{|\vec{S}|\times|\vec{S}|} & \mathbf{v}'^{\mathrm{T}}_{\vec{S}'\vec{\alpha}'} \end{pmatrix}_{\vec{S}'\vec{L}}\right] \\
&\qquad\qquad \times \det\left[\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{u}'_{\vec{\alpha}'\vec{S}'} & \mathbf{u}'_{\vec{\alpha}'\vec{B}'}\mathbf{v}'^{\mathrm{T}}_{\vec{B}'\vec{\alpha}'} \end{pmatrix}_{\vec{\alpha}',\vec{\alpha}'\setminus\vec{L}}\right] \\
&\qquad = (-1)^{|\vec{S}|} \det\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{|\vec{S}|\times|\vec{S}|} & \mathbf{v}^{\mathrm{T}}_{\vec{S}\vec{\alpha}} \\ \mathbf{u}_{\vec{\alpha}\vec{S}} & \mathbf{u}_{\vec{\alpha}\vec{B}}\mathbf{v}^{\mathrm{T}}_{\vec{B}\vec{\alpha}} \end{pmatrix}.
\end{aligned}$$

In the first equality, we apply Eq. (S8) together with the fact that, for each term in the sum for which $\vec{L}$ contains any of the first $|\vec{S}|$ columns, the matrix in the first determinant factor of that term contains at least one column of all zeros, and so the term evaluates to zero. This brings the second line to a form which we recognize to be an expansion by complementary minors of the rows $\vec{S}'$ in the larger matrix in the third line. Finally, we use $\mathbf{u}'_{\vec{\alpha}'\vec{S}'} = \mathbf{u}_{\vec{\alpha}\vec{S}}$ (and similarly for the other submatrices) to undo our initial row and column rearrangements and therefore obtain the formula, Eq. (S4). □

APPENDIX C: FIXED-PARITY SUM

Here we prove

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{\substack{\{\vec{\beta}_l\subset\vec{B}_l,\vec{\beta}_r\subset\vec{B}_r||\vec{\beta}_l|+|\vec{\beta}_r|=|\vec{\alpha}|-|\vec{S}|,\\ |\vec{\beta}_r| \bmod 2 = p\}}} \det\left[\mathbf{u}_{\vec{\alpha},(\vec{\beta}_l,\vec{S},\vec{\beta}_r)}\right] \det\left[\mathbf{v}_{\vec{\alpha},(\vec{\beta}_l,\vec{S},\vec{\beta}_r)}\right] \\
&\qquad = \frac{(-1)^{|\vec{S}|}}{2}\left[\det\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{|\vec{S}|\times|\vec{S}|} & \mathbf{v}^{\mathrm{T}}_{\vec{S}\vec{\alpha}} \\ \mathbf{u}_{\vec{\alpha}\vec{S}} & \mathbf{u}_{\vec{\alpha}\vec{B}}\mathbf{v}^{\mathrm{T}}_{\vec{B}\vec{\alpha}} \end{pmatrix} + (-1)^p \det\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{|\vec{S}|\times|\vec{S}|} & \tilde{\mathbf{v}}^{\mathrm{T}}_{\vec{S}\vec{\alpha}} \\ \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{\vec{\alpha}\vec{S}} & \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{\vec{\alpha}\vec{B}}\tilde{\mathbf{v}}^{\mathrm{T}}_{\vec{B}\vec{\alpha}} \end{pmatrix}\right],
\end{aligned} \tag{S9}$$

where $\vec{S}$ is disjoint from $\vec{B} \equiv (\vec{B}_l, \vec{B}_r)$, $\tilde{u}_{jk} = u_{jk}$ for $k \notin \vec{B}_r$, and $\tilde{u}_{jk} = iu_{jk}$ for $k \in \vec{B}_r$. The statement follows simply from

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left(\sum_{\substack{\{\vec{\beta}_l\subset\vec{B}_l,\vec{\beta}_r\subset\vec{B}_r||\vec{\beta}_l|+|\vec{\beta}_r|=|\vec{\alpha}|-|\vec{S}|,\\ |\vec{\beta}_r| \text{ even}\}}} - \sum_{\substack{\{\vec{\beta}_l\subset\vec{B}_l,\vec{\beta}_r\subset\vec{B}_r||\vec{\beta}_l|+|\vec{\beta}_r|=|\vec{\alpha}|-|\vec{S}|,\\ |\vec{\beta}_r| \text{ odd}\}}}\right) \det\left[\mathbf{u}_{\vec{\alpha},(\vec{\beta}_l,\vec{S},\vec{\beta}_r)}\right] \det\left[\mathbf{v}_{\vec{\alpha},(\vec{\beta}_l,\vec{S},\vec{\beta}_r)}\right] \\
&\qquad = \left(\sum_{\substack{\{\vec{\beta}_l\subset\vec{B}_l,\vec{\beta}_r\subset\vec{B}_r||\vec{\beta}_l|+|\vec{\beta}_r|=|\vec{\alpha}|-|\vec{S}|,\\ |\vec{\beta}_r| \text{ even}\}}} i^{2|\vec{\beta}_r|} + \sum_{\substack{\{\vec{\beta}_l\subset\vec{B}_l,\vec{\beta}_r\subset\vec{B}_r||\vec{\beta}_l|+|\vec{\beta}_r|=|\vec{\alpha}|-|\vec{S}|,\\ |\vec{\beta}_r| \text{ odd}\}}} i^{2|\vec{\beta}_r|}\right) \det\left[\mathbf{u}_{\vec{\alpha},(\vec{\beta}_l,\vec{S},\vec{\beta}_r)}\right] \det\left[\mathbf{v}_{\vec{\alpha},(\vec{\beta}_l,\vec{S},\vec{\beta}_r)}\right] \\
&\qquad = \sum_{\{(\vec{\beta}_l,\vec{\beta}_r)\subset\vec{B}||\vec{\beta}_l|+|\vec{\beta}_r|=|\vec{\alpha}|-|\vec{S}|\}} i^{2|\vec{\beta}_r|} \det\left[\mathbf{u}_{\vec{\alpha},(\vec{\beta}_l,\vec{S},\vec{\beta}_r)}\right] \det\left[\mathbf{v}_{\vec{\alpha},(\vec{\beta}_l,\vec{S},\vec{\beta}_r)}\right]
\end{aligned}$$

In the first equality, we used the fact that $i^{2|\vec{\beta}_r|} = 1$ in the former sum, and $i^{2|\vec{\beta}_r|} = -1$ in the latter. In the second, we simply combined the sums over all even-sized $\vec{\beta}_r$ and all odd-sized $\vec{\beta}_r$ with the same summand into the sum over all $(\vec{\beta}_l, \vec{\beta}_r)$. We next use the linearity of the determinant in its columns to bring each of the $2|\vec{\beta}_r|$ factors of i onto a corresponding column in $\vec{\beta}_r$ of either $\mathbf{u}$ or $\mathbf{v}$, therefore giving

$$\left(\sum_{\substack{\{\vec{\beta}_l \subset \vec{B}_l, \vec{\beta}_r \subset \vec{B}_r || \vec{\beta}_l| + |\vec{\beta}_r| = |\vec{\alpha}| - |\vec{S}|, \\ |\vec{\beta}_r| \text{ even}\}}} - \sum_{\substack{\{\vec{\beta}_l \subset \vec{B}_l, \vec{\beta}_r \subset \vec{B}_r || \vec{\beta}_l| + |\vec{\beta}_r| = |\vec{\alpha}| - |\vec{S}|, \\ |\vec{\beta}_r| \text{ odd}\}}} \right) \det\left[\mathbf{u}_{\vec{\alpha},(\vec{\beta}_l,\vec{S},\vec{\beta}_r)}\right] \det\left[\mathbf{v}_{\vec{\alpha},(\vec{\beta}_l,\vec{S},\vec{\beta}_r)}\right]$$
$$= \sum_{\{(\vec{\beta}_l,\vec{\beta}_r) \subset \vec{B} || \vec{\beta}_l| + |\vec{\beta}_r| = |\vec{\alpha}| - |\vec{S}|\}} \det\left[\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{\vec{\alpha},(\vec{\beta}_l,\vec{S},\vec{\beta}_r)}\right] \det\left[\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{\vec{\alpha},(\vec{\beta}_l,\vec{S},\vec{\beta}_r)}\right]$$
$$= (-1)^{|\vec{S}|} \det \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{|\vec{S}| \times |\vec{S}|} & \tilde{\mathbf{v}}^{\mathrm{T}}_{\vec{S}\vec{\alpha}} \\ \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{\vec{\alpha}\vec{S}} & \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{\vec{\alpha}\vec{B}} \tilde{\mathbf{v}}^{\mathrm{T}}_{\vec{B}\vec{\alpha}} \end{pmatrix},$$

from Eq. (S4). Applying this, together with

$$\left(\sum_{\substack{\{\vec{\beta}_l \subset \vec{B}_l, \vec{\beta}_r \subset \vec{B}_r || \vec{\beta}_l| + |\vec{\beta}_r| = |\vec{\alpha}| - |\vec{S}|, \\ |\vec{\beta}_r| \text{ even}\}}} + \sum_{\substack{\{\vec{\beta}_l \subset \vec{B}_l, \vec{\beta}_r \subset \vec{B}_r || \vec{\beta}_l| + |\vec{\beta}_r| = |\vec{\alpha}| - |\vec{S}|, \\ |\vec{\beta}_r| \text{ odd}\}}} \right) \det\left[\mathbf{u}_{\vec{\alpha},(\vec{\beta}_l,\vec{S},\vec{\beta}_r)}\right] \det\left[\mathbf{v}_{\vec{\alpha},(\vec{\beta}_l,\vec{S},\vec{\beta}_r)}\right]$$
$$= (-1)^{|\vec{S}|} \det \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{|\vec{S}| \times |\vec{S}|} & \mathbf{v}^{\mathrm{T}}_{\vec{S}\vec{\alpha}} \\ \mathbf{u}_{\vec{\alpha}\vec{S}} & \mathbf{u}_{\vec{\alpha}\vec{B}} \mathbf{v}^{\mathrm{T}}_{\vec{B}\vec{\alpha}} \end{pmatrix}$$

we solve for the sums over even $|\vec{\beta}_r|$ and odd $|\vec{\beta}_r|$ individually to obtain Eq. (S9) above. □

APPENDIX D: EXACT CALCULATION OF THE OTO CORRELATOR – PROOF OF THEOREM 1

Here we give an explicit calculation of the matrix $\mathbf{M}_s$, defined implicitly by

$$\frac{1}{2^{n+2}} ||[\mathbf{n}_s \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_s, \hat{U}^\dagger \hat{C}_{\vec{\alpha}} \hat{U}]||^2 \equiv \mathbf{n}_s^* \cdot \mathbf{M}_s \cdot \mathbf{n}_s \tag{S10}$$

for some single-spin operator $\mathbf{n}_s \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_s$ acting on qubit s, matchgate unitary $\hat{U}$, and Clifford configuration $\hat{C}_{\vec{\alpha}}$, where $||\hat{A}||^2 \equiv \mathrm{tr}\left(\hat{A}^\dagger \hat{A}\right)$. Since we are only considering a single spin s, we drop the spin labels on $\mathbf{n} \equiv \mathbf{n}_s$ and $\mathbf{M} \equiv \mathbf{M}_s$ in this section for convenience, choosing to label the components of these objects by subscripts instead. We begin by expanding the r.h.s., using this definition and Eq. (S1)

$$\frac{1}{2^{n+2}} ||[\mathbf{n} \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_s, \hat{U}^\dagger \hat{C}_{\vec{\alpha}} \hat{U}]||^2 = \frac{1}{2^{n+2}} \mathrm{tr}\left\{ \left[\sum_{k \in \{x,y,z\}} n_k \hat{\sigma}_s^k, \sum_{\{\vec{\beta} || \vec{\beta}| = |\vec{\alpha}|\}} \det\left(\mathbf{u}_{\vec{\alpha}\vec{\beta}}\right) \hat{C}_{\vec{\beta}} \right]^\dagger \left[\sum_{k' \in \{x,y,z\}} n_{k'} \hat{\sigma}_s^{k'}, \sum_{\{\vec{\beta}' || \vec{\beta}'| = |\vec{\alpha}|\}} \det\left(\mathbf{u}_{\vec{\alpha}\vec{\beta}'}\right) \hat{C}_{\vec{\beta}'} \right] \right\}$$
$$= \frac{1}{2^{n+2}} \sum_{k,k' \in \{x,y,z\}} n_k^* n_{k'} \sum_{\substack{\{\vec{\beta} || \vec{\beta}| = |\vec{\alpha}|\} \\ \{\vec{\beta}' || \vec{\beta}'| = |\vec{\alpha}|\}}} \det\left(\mathbf{u}_{\vec{\alpha}\vec{\beta}}\right) \det\left(\mathbf{u}_{\vec{\alpha}\vec{\beta}'}\right) \mathrm{tr}\left\{ \left[\hat{\sigma}_s^k, \hat{C}_{\vec{\beta}}\right]^\dagger \left[\hat{\sigma}_s^{k'}, \hat{C}_{\vec{\beta}'}\right] \right\}$$

Thus

$$M_{kk'} \equiv \frac{1}{2^{n+2}} \sum_{\substack{\{\vec{\beta} || \vec{\beta}| = |\vec{\alpha}|\} \\ \{\vec{\beta}' || \vec{\beta}'| = |\vec{\alpha}|\}}} \det\left(\mathbf{u}_{\vec{\alpha}\vec{\beta}}\right) \det\left(\mathbf{u}_{\vec{\alpha}\vec{\beta}'}\right) \mathrm{tr}\left\{ \left[\hat{\sigma}_s^k, \hat{C}_{\vec{\beta}}\right]^\dagger \left[\hat{\sigma}_s^{k'}, \hat{C}_{\vec{\beta}'}\right] \right\}$$

We first consider the diagonal elements of $\mathbf{M}$, for which $k = k'$. It is straightforward to see that the only terms which will not vanish in this case are those for which $\vec{\beta} = \vec{\beta}'$, as these configurations must describe the same Pauli

string or the term will vanish by trace-orthonormality of the Pauli operators, and the Jordan-Wigner transformation is one-to-one. Additionally, the terms for which a $\hat{\sigma}_s^k$ or $\hat{\mathbb{1}}_s$ is present in $\hat{C}_{\vec{\beta}}$ will also vanish, and we have

$$\begin{aligned} M_{kk} &= \frac{1}{2^{n+2}} \sum_{k' \notin \{0,k\}} \sum_{\{\vec{\beta} || \vec{\beta}| = |\vec{\alpha}|, \hat{\sigma}_s^{k'} \text{ present}\}} \det\left(\mathbf{u}_{\vec{\alpha}\vec{\beta}}\right)^2 || \left[\hat{\sigma}_s^k, \hat{\sigma}_s^{k'}\right] ||^2 \\ M_{kk} &= \sum_{k' \notin \{0,k\}} \sum_{\{\vec{\beta} || \vec{\beta}| = |\vec{\alpha}|, \hat{\sigma}_s^{k'} \text{ present}\}} \det\left(\mathbf{u}_{\vec{\alpha}\vec{\beta}}\right)^2, \end{aligned} \tag{S11}$$

where we take $\hat{\sigma}_s^0 = \hat{\mathbb{1}}_s$, and we've used the fact that $|| \left[\hat{\sigma}_s^k, \hat{\sigma}_s^{k'}\right] ||^2 = 2^{n+2}$ for $k' \notin \{0, k\}$. We next examine the conditions under which an operator $\hat{\sigma}_s^{k'}$ will be present in $\hat{C}_{\vec{\beta}}$. Let $\vec{\beta} = \left(\vec{\beta}_l, \vec{\beta}_s, \vec{\beta}_r\right)$, where $\vec{\beta}_l \subset [2(s-1)]$ consists of all indices less than $2s-1$, and $\vec{\beta}_r \subset \overline{[2s]}$ consists of all indices greater than $2s$ (corresponding to the spins to the left and right of s, respectively). We have

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\sigma}_s^x \text{ present only if either : } \vec{\beta}_s &= \begin{cases} (2s-1) & \text{and } |\vec{\beta}_r| \text{ even} \\ (2s) & \text{and } |\vec{\beta}_r| \text{ odd} \end{cases} \\ \hat{\sigma}_s^y \text{ present only if either : } \vec{\beta}_s &= \begin{cases} (2s) & \text{and } |\vec{\beta}_r| \text{ even} \\ (2s-1) & \text{and } |\vec{\beta}_r| \text{ odd} \end{cases} \\ \hat{\sigma}_s^z \text{ present only if either : } \vec{\beta}_s &= \begin{cases} (2s-1, 2s) & \text{and } |\vec{\beta}_r| \text{ even} \\ () & \text{and } |\vec{\beta}_r| \text{ odd} \end{cases} \end{aligned} \tag{S12}$$

From Eq. (S12), we see that the sum for each k' in Eq. (S11) is of the form calculated in Eq. (S9). Thus, we let

$$\xi_k \equiv \sum_{\{\vec{\beta} || \vec{\beta}| = |\vec{\alpha}|, \hat{\sigma}_s^k \text{ present}\}} \det\left(\mathbf{u}_{\vec{\alpha}\vec{\beta}}\right)^2,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{w} &\equiv \mathbf{u}_{\vec{\alpha}\overline{(2s-1,2s)}} \mathbf{u}^{\mathrm{T}}_{\overline{(2s-1,2s)}\vec{\alpha}} \\ \tilde{\mathbf{w}} &\equiv \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{\vec{\alpha}\overline{(2s-1,2s)}} \tilde{\mathbf{u}}^{\mathrm{T}}_{\overline{(2s-1,2s)}\vec{\alpha}}, \end{aligned}$$

which gives

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_x &= -\frac{1}{2}\left[\det\begin{pmatrix} 0 & \mathbf{u}^{\mathrm{T}}_{(2s-1)\vec{\alpha}} \\ \mathbf{u}_{\vec{\alpha}(2s-1)} & \mathbf{w} \end{pmatrix} + \det\begin{pmatrix} 0 & \tilde{\mathbf{u}}^{\mathrm{T}}_{(2s-1)\vec{\alpha}} \\ \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{\vec{\alpha}(2s-1)} & \tilde{\mathbf{w}} \end{pmatrix} + \det\begin{pmatrix} 0 & \mathbf{u}^{\mathrm{T}}_{(2s)\vec{\alpha}} \\ \mathbf{u}_{\vec{\alpha}(2s)} & \mathbf{w} \end{pmatrix} - \det\begin{pmatrix} 0 & \tilde{\mathbf{u}}^{\mathrm{T}}_{(2s)\vec{\alpha}} \\ \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{\vec{\alpha}(2s)} & \tilde{\mathbf{w}} \end{pmatrix}\right] \\ \xi_y &= -\frac{1}{2}\left[\det\begin{pmatrix} 0 & \mathbf{u}^{\mathrm{T}}_{(2s-1)\vec{\alpha}} \\ \mathbf{u}_{\vec{\alpha}(2s-1)} & \mathbf{w} \end{pmatrix} - \det\begin{pmatrix} 0 & \tilde{\mathbf{u}}^{\mathrm{T}}_{(2s-1)\vec{\alpha}} \\ \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{\vec{\alpha}(2s-1)} & \tilde{\mathbf{w}} \end{pmatrix} + \det\begin{pmatrix} 0 & \mathbf{u}^{\mathrm{T}}_{(2s)\vec{\alpha}} \\ \mathbf{u}_{\vec{\alpha}(2s)} & \mathbf{w} \end{pmatrix} + \det\begin{pmatrix} 0 & \tilde{\mathbf{u}}^{\mathrm{T}}_{(2s)\vec{\alpha}} \\ \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{\vec{\alpha}(2s)} & \tilde{\mathbf{w}} \end{pmatrix}\right] \\ \xi_z &= \frac{1}{2}\left[\det(\mathbf{w}) - \det(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}) + \det\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{2\times 2} & \mathbf{u}^{\mathrm{T}}_{(2s-1,2s)\vec{\alpha}} \\ \mathbf{u}_{\vec{\alpha}(2s-1,2s)} & \mathbf{w} \end{pmatrix} + \det\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{2\times 2} & \tilde{\mathbf{u}}^{\mathrm{T}}_{(2s-1,2s)\vec{\alpha}} \\ \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{\vec{\alpha}(2s-1,2s)} & \tilde{\mathbf{w}} \end{pmatrix}\right], \end{aligned}$$

This allows us to calculate M_{kk} as the sum of 8 determinants of $O(|\vec{\alpha}|) \times O(|\vec{\alpha}|)$ matrices. We list the complete solution below, but first let us calculate the off-diagonal elements of $\mathbf{M}$. Clearly, $\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{M}^{\mathrm{T}}$ by the cyclic property of the trace and the fact that the sum over $\vec{\beta}$ and $\vec{\beta}'$ is symmetric in these indices. Furthermore, we must have $M_{xz} = M_{yz} = 0$ since there are no $\vec{\beta}$ and $\vec{\beta}'$ for which $|\vec{\beta}| = |\vec{\beta}'|$ and which describe the same Pauli string on every spin except s, with a $\hat{\sigma}_s^{\{x,y\}}$ present on one and a $\hat{\sigma}_s^z$ present on the other. This is because the former are always described by exactly one Clifford operator and the latter by either two or zero Clifford operators. Therefore, we are only left to calculate M_{xy}. In this case, we have

$$M_{xy} = \frac{1}{2^{n+2}} \sum_{\substack{\{\vec{\beta}||\vec{\beta}|=|\vec{\alpha}|\} \\ \{\vec{\beta}'||\vec{\beta}'|=|\vec{\alpha}|\}}} \det\left(\mathbf{u}_{\vec{\alpha}\vec{\beta}}\right) \det\left(\mathbf{u}_{\vec{\alpha}\vec{\beta}'}\right) \mathrm{tr}\left\{\left[\hat{\sigma}_s^x, \hat{C}_{\vec{\beta}}\right]^\dagger \left[\hat{\sigma}_s^y, \hat{C}_{\vec{\beta}'}\right]\right\}$$

As before, the only nonvanishing terms will be those for which $\vec{\beta}$ and $\vec{\beta}'$ describe the same Pauli string on every spin except for s and for which there is a $\hat{\sigma}_s^y$ present for $\hat{C}_{\vec{\beta}}$ and a $\hat{\sigma}_s^x$ present for $\hat{C}_{\vec{\beta}'}$. We again apply the conditions (S12). However, this time we do need to be careful of the phases (remember, M_{xy} is not the norm of an operator, so it need not be real and nonnegative). Namely, when $|\vec{\beta}_r|$ is odd, then $\hat{C}_{\vec{\beta}}$ and $\hat{C}_{\vec{\beta}'}$ will have a relative phase of -1 between them since $\hat{\sigma}_s^x\hat{\sigma}_s^z = -i\hat{\sigma}_s^y$, but $\hat{\sigma}_s^y\hat{\sigma}_s^z = i\hat{\sigma}_s^x$. Additionally taking into account the fact that $[\hat{\sigma}_s^x, \hat{\sigma}_s^y] = -[\hat{\sigma}_s^y, \hat{\sigma}_s^x]$ gives

$$M_{xy} = \left(\sum_{\substack{\{(\vec{\beta}_l,\vec{\beta}_r)||\vec{\beta}_l|+|\vec{\beta}_r|+1=|\vec{\alpha}|, \\ |\vec{\beta}_r| \text{ odd}\}}} - \sum_{\substack{\{(\vec{\beta}_l,\vec{\beta}_r)||\vec{\beta}_l|+|\vec{\beta}_r|+1=|\vec{\alpha}|, \\ |\vec{\beta}_r| \text{ even}\}}} \right) \det\left[\mathbf{u}_{\vec{\alpha}(\vec{\beta}_l,2s-1,\vec{\beta}_r)}\right] \det\left[\mathbf{u}_{\vec{\alpha}(\vec{\beta}_l,2s,\vec{\beta}_r)}\right]$$

$$M_{xy} = \det\begin{pmatrix} 0 & \tilde{\mathbf{u}}^{\mathrm{T}}_{(2s)\vec{\alpha}} \\ \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{\vec{\alpha}(2s-1)} & \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{\vec{\alpha}\overline{(2s-1,2s)}}\tilde{\mathbf{u}}^{\mathrm{T}}_{\overline{(2s-1,2s)}\vec{\alpha}} \end{pmatrix},$$

therefore completing the calculation. For completeness, we list the elements of $\mathbf{M}$, once again, below

$$\begin{aligned} M_{xx} &= \xi_y + \xi_z \\ M_{yy} &= \xi_x + \xi_z \\ M_{zz} &= \xi_x + \xi_y \\ M_{xy} = M_{yx} &= \det\begin{pmatrix} 0 & \tilde{\mathbf{u}}^{\mathrm{T}}_{(2s)\vec{\alpha}} \\ \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{\vec{\alpha}(2s-1)} & \tilde{\mathbf{w}} \end{pmatrix} \\ M_{xz} = M_{zx} = M_{yz} = M_{zy} &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\xi_x = -\frac{1}{2}\left[\det\begin{pmatrix} 0 & \mathbf{u}^{\mathrm{T}}_{(2s-1)\vec{\alpha}} \\ \mathbf{u}_{\vec{\alpha}(2s-1)} & \mathbf{w} \end{pmatrix} + \det\begin{pmatrix} 0 & \tilde{\mathbf{u}}^{\mathrm{T}}_{(2s-1)\vec{\alpha}} \\ \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{\vec{\alpha}(2s-1)} & \tilde{\mathbf{w}} \end{pmatrix} + \det\begin{pmatrix} 0 & \mathbf{u}^{\mathrm{T}}_{(2s)\vec{\alpha}} \\ \mathbf{u}_{\vec{\alpha}(2s)} & \mathbf{w} \end{pmatrix} - \det\begin{pmatrix} 0 & \tilde{\mathbf{u}}^{\mathrm{T}}_{(2s)\vec{\alpha}} \\ \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{\vec{\alpha}(2s)} & \tilde{\mathbf{w}} \end{pmatrix}\right]$$

$$\xi_y = -\frac{1}{2}\left[\det\begin{pmatrix} 0 & \mathbf{u}^{\mathrm{T}}_{(2s-1)\vec{\alpha}} \\ \mathbf{u}_{\vec{\alpha}(2s-1)} & \mathbf{w} \end{pmatrix} - \det\begin{pmatrix} 0 & \tilde{\mathbf{u}}^{\mathrm{T}}_{(2s-1)\vec{\alpha}} \\ \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{\vec{\alpha}(2s-1)} & \tilde{\mathbf{w}} \end{pmatrix} + \det\begin{pmatrix} 0 & \mathbf{u}^{\mathrm{T}}_{(2s)\vec{\alpha}} \\ \mathbf{u}_{\vec{\alpha}(2s)} & \mathbf{w} \end{pmatrix} + \det\begin{pmatrix} 0 & \tilde{\mathbf{u}}^{\mathrm{T}}_{(2s)\vec{\alpha}} \\ \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{\vec{\alpha}(2s)} & \tilde{\mathbf{w}} \end{pmatrix}\right]$$

$$\xi_z = \frac{1}{2}\left[\det(\mathbf{w}) - \det(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}) + \det\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{2\times 2} & \mathbf{u}^{\mathrm{T}}_{(2s-1,2s)\vec{\alpha}} \\ \mathbf{u}_{\vec{\alpha}(2s-1,2s)} & \mathbf{w} \end{pmatrix} + \det\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{2\times 2} & \tilde{\mathbf{u}}^{\mathrm{T}}_{(2s-1,2s)\vec{\alpha}} \\ \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{\vec{\alpha}(2s-1,2s)} & \tilde{\mathbf{w}} \end{pmatrix}\right],$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{w} &\equiv \mathbf{u}_{\vec{\alpha}\overline{(2s-1,2s)}}\mathbf{u}^{\mathrm{T}}_{\overline{(2s-1,2s)}\vec{\alpha}} \\ \tilde{\mathbf{w}} &\equiv \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{\vec{\alpha}\overline{(2s-1,2s)}}\tilde{\mathbf{u}}^{\mathrm{T}}_{\overline{(2s-1,2s)}\vec{\alpha}}. \end{aligned} \qquad \square$$

APPENDIX E: PROOF OF THEOREM 2

Here we prove the statement

$$\overline{|\langle\hat{O}\rangle - \langle(\otimes_{s\in S}\mathcal{E}_s)(\hat{O})\rangle|} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^{n+2}}}\sum_{s\in S}||[\mathbf{n}_s\cdot\hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_s,\hat{O}]|| \equiv \sum_{s\in S}\sqrt{\mathbf{n}_s^*\cdot\mathbf{M}_s\cdot\mathbf{n}_s}, \tag{S13}$$

where the average $\overline{(\cdot)}$ is taken over a product basis $\{\otimes_{j=1}^n|(-1)^{\ell_j}\mathbf{n}_j^\perp\rangle\}_{\boldsymbol{\ell}\in\{0,1\}^{\times n}}$ whose Bloch axes are orthogonal to the $\{\mathbf{n}_s\}_s$, and $\mathcal{E}_s$ is the depolarizing channel on qubit s, given by

$$\mathcal{E}_s(\hat{O}) = \frac{1}{4}\left(\hat{O} + \sum_{k\in\{x,y,z\}}\hat{\sigma}_s^k\hat{O}\hat{\sigma}_s^k\right). \tag{S14}$$

This channel has the effect of projecting $\hat{O}$ onto its component which acts only as the identity on site s. We further assume that $\hat{O}$ is a traceless Hermitian operator. We first show that the left-hand side of Eq. (S13) is bounded by the trace norm for any averaging orthonormal basis set $\{|j\rangle\}_j$ and Hermitian operator $\hat{A}$, as

$$\begin{aligned}
\overline{|\langle\hat{A}\rangle|} &\equiv \frac{1}{2^n}\sum_{j=1}^{2^n}|\langle j|\hat{A}|j\rangle| \\
&= \frac{1}{2^n}\sum_{j=1}^{2^n}|\sum_{k=1}^{2^n}U_{kj}^* d_k U_{kj}| \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2^n}\sum_{j,k=1}^{2^n}|d_k||U_{kj}|^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{2^n}\sum_{k=1}^{2^n}|d_k| \\
\overline{|\langle\hat{A}\rangle|} &\leq \frac{1}{2^n}\,\mathrm{tr}\,|\hat{A}|
\end{aligned} \tag{S15}$$

From the first to the second line, we used the fact that we assume $\hat{A}$ to be a Hermitian operator, and so can be diagonalized as $\hat{A} = \hat{U}^\dagger\hat{D}\hat{U}$, for $\hat{D}$ a diagonal matrix. From the second to the third line, we applied the triangle inequality, and from the third to the fourth line, we rearranged sums and used the fact that $\sum_{j=1}^{2^n}|U_{kj}|^2 = 1$. The resulting quantity is the trace norm.

Without loss of generality, let $S = \{1, 2, \ldots, |S|\}$. Then we have, for any input state

$$\begin{aligned}
|\langle\hat{O}\rangle - \langle(\otimes_{s\in S}\mathcal{E}_s)(\hat{O})\rangle| &= |\langle\hat{O}\rangle + \sum_{k=1}^{|S|-1}\left[\langle\left(\otimes_{j=1}^k\mathcal{E}_j\right)(\hat{O})\rangle - \langle\left(\otimes_{j=1}^k\mathcal{E}_j\right)(\hat{O})\rangle\right] - \langle(\otimes_{s\in S}\mathcal{E}_s)(\hat{O})\rangle| \\
&= |\sum_{k=1}^{|S|}\left\{\langle\left(\otimes_{j=1}^{k-1}\mathcal{E}_j\right)(\hat{O})\rangle - \langle\left(\otimes_{j=1}^{k-1}\mathcal{E}_j\right)\left[\mathcal{E}_k(\hat{O})\right]\rangle\right\}| \\
|\langle\hat{O}\rangle - \langle(\otimes_{j\in S}\mathcal{E}_j)(\hat{O})\rangle| &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{|S|}|\langle\left(\otimes_{j=1}^{k-1}\mathcal{E}_j\right)(\hat{O})\rangle - \langle\left(\otimes_{j=1}^{k-1}\mathcal{E}_j\right)\left[\mathcal{E}_k(\hat{O})\right]\rangle|,
\end{aligned} \tag{S16}$$

where, from the first to the second line, we expressed the difference as a telescoping sum (let $\otimes_{j=1}^0\mathcal{E}_j(\hat{O}) \equiv \hat{O}$) and applied the triangle inequality in the third line. Next, we use the fact that, for any single-spin input $|\mathbf{n}^\perp\rangle$, the depolarized operator expectation value is the same as that of the dephased operator in any basis orthogonal to the input. That is, let $(\mathbf{n}\cdot\hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}})\,|\mathbf{n}^\perp\rangle = e^{i\phi}|-\mathbf{n}^\perp\rangle$ for some phase ϕ, and we have

$$|\langle\hat{O}\rangle - \langle\mathcal{E}_s(\hat{O})\rangle| = |\langle\hat{O}\rangle - \langle\frac{1}{2}\left[\hat{O} + (\mathbf{n}\cdot\hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_s)\,\hat{O}\,(\mathbf{n}\cdot\hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_s)\right]\rangle| = \frac{1}{2}|\langle\hat{O}\rangle - \langle(\mathbf{n}\cdot\hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_s)\,\hat{O}\,(\mathbf{n}\cdot\hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_s)\rangle| \tag{S17}$$

on input state $|\mathbf{n}^\perp\rangle$ on qubit s. Furthermore, taking the same quantity for input state $|-\mathbf{n}^\perp\rangle$ has the effect of exchanging $\hat{O}$ and $(\mathbf{n}\cdot\hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_s)\,\hat{O}\,(\mathbf{n}\cdot\hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_s)$ inside the absolute value, leaving it unchanged. Thus, we average over a product basis of $\{\otimes_{j=1}^n|(-1)^{\ell_j}\mathbf{n}_j^\perp\rangle\}_{\boldsymbol{\ell}\in\{0,1\}^{\times n}}$ on both sides of Eq. (S16) and apply Eq. (S17) to obtain

$$\overline{|\langle\hat{O}\rangle - \langle(\otimes_{s\in S}\mathcal{E}_s)(\hat{O})\rangle|} \leq \frac{1}{2^{n+1}}\sum_{k=1}^{|S|}\mathrm{tr}\,|\left(\otimes_{j=1}^{k-1}\mathcal{E}_j\right)(\hat{O}) - \left(\otimes_{j=1}^{k-1}\mathcal{E}_j\right)\left[(\mathbf{n}_k\cdot\hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_k)\,\hat{O}\,(\mathbf{n}_k\cdot\hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_k)\right]|$$
$$\overline{|\langle\hat{O}\rangle - \langle(\otimes_{s\in S}\mathcal{E}_s)(\hat{O})\rangle|} \leq \frac{1}{2^{n+1}}\sum_{k=1}^{|S|}\mathrm{tr}\,|\hat{O} - (\mathbf{n}_k\cdot\hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_k)\,\hat{O}\,(\mathbf{n}_k\cdot\hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_k)\,|,$$

using the bound (S15) in the second line and the fact that the depolarizing channel cannot increase the trace distance between operators in the third. Finally, we apply the operator norm inequality

$$\mathrm{tr}\,|\hat{A}| \equiv \mathrm{tr}\,\sqrt{\hat{A}^\dagger\hat{A}} \leq \sqrt{r\,\mathrm{tr}\,\hat{A}^\dagger\hat{A}} \leq \sqrt{2^n\,\mathrm{tr}\,\hat{A}^\dagger\hat{A}},$$

where $r \leq 2^n$ is the rank of $\hat{A}$, together with the fact that

$$\mathrm{tr}\left\{\left[\hat{O} - (\mathbf{n}_k\cdot\hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_k)\,\hat{O}\,(\mathbf{n}_k\cdot\hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_k)\right]^\dagger\left[\hat{O} - (\mathbf{n}_k\cdot\hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_k)\,\hat{O}\,(\mathbf{n}_k\cdot\hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_k)\right]\right\} = ||[\mathbf{n}_k\cdot\hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_k, \hat{O}]||^2,$$

for $||\cdot||$ the Frobenius norm, to arrive at our result

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{|\langle\hat{O}\rangle - \langle(\otimes_{s\in S}\mathcal{E}_s)(\hat{O})\rangle|} &\leq \frac{1}{2^{n+1}}\sum_{s\in S}\mathrm{tr}\,|\hat{O} - (\mathbf{n}_s\cdot\hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_s)\,\hat{O}\,(\mathbf{n}_s\cdot\hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_s)\,| \\ &\leq \frac{\sqrt{2^n}}{2^{n+1}}\sum_{s\in S}||[\mathbf{n}_s\cdot\hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_s, \hat{O}]|| \\ \overline{|\langle\hat{O}\rangle - \langle(\otimes_{s\in S}\mathcal{E}_s)(\hat{O})\rangle|} &\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^{n+2}}}\sum_{s\in S}||[\mathbf{n}_s\cdot\hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_s, \hat{O}]|| \equiv \sum_{s\in S}\sqrt{\mathbf{n}_s^*\cdot\mathbf{M}_s\cdot\mathbf{n}_s}. \qquad \square\end{aligned}$$

We remark that the bound is a sum of terms which are always between zero and one, and by Markov's inequality, we can use this result to bound the fraction of these basis states for which the change in expectation value exceeds some threshold δ

$$\mu\left[|\langle\hat{O}\rangle - \langle(\otimes_{s\in S}\mathcal{E}_s)(\hat{O})\rangle| \geq \delta\right] \leq \frac{1}{\delta}\sum_{s\in S}\sqrt{\mathbf{n}_s^*\cdot\mathbf{M}_s\cdot\mathbf{n}_s}.$$

Since we expect each of these terms to be exponentially decaying outside of the lightcone, depolarizing in this region should only induce a change in expectation value greater than the threshold for some exponentially small set of input states. This affords us exponential precision so long as we are willing to tolerate a fixed fraction of these "pathological" states. Finally, since we had a freedom in choosing which basis over which to depolarize in Eq. (S17), we may optimize each of the $\{\mathbf{n}_s\}_s$ over the subspace for which they are orthogonal to the Bloch axes of the input to make this bound as restrictive as possible.